COUNTY COUNCIL – 7TH DECEMBER 2010
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.4

Question from Councillor R Moss Eccardt to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire

The planning permission for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) (and nearby fringe developments) depended on the creation of the Addenbrooke's Access Road (AAR) which was also conditioned to not become a 'rat run'. A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) has been made. Confusion abounds as to the enforcement regime for this TRO. Could the Lead Member provide a succinct and correct description of how the TRO will be enforced and, if not, will he consider his position?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire

As Councillor Moss-Eccardt states, the planning permission for the AAR contained a condition that measures were to be put in place to prevent the route being used a as a through route.

To satisfy this condition, the county council, working in partnership with the hospital Trust, the police and the MediPark developers on the Addenbrooke's site, has made a traffic regulation order which makes it an offence to drive through the hospital site without requiring access to the site itself thereby preventing the use of the AAR and the roads in the hospital site as a through route.

The traffic order was implemented through the normal legal procedures for traffic regulation orders and as no objections were raised at the consultation and formal advertisement stage, the order was made under delegated powers.

As with any other 'access only' traffic order, the Addenbrooke's site order is enforceable by the police through normal enforcement operations. However, to supplement these operations, the developers of the MediPark development have funded the installation of an automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) camera system.

The ANPR system records motor vehicle registration plates at all entry and exit points to the hospital site and these are then cross matched and the journey times through the site monitored to detect through motor vehicle movements. The camera system meets all current relevant Government design and operational protocols.

If vehicles are found to be using the hospital roads as a through route, the number plate details are then provided to the police for enforcement purposes. Initial enforcement action will involve the issuing of warning letters to registered keepers of the vehicles. If recipients of warning letters consider that they have a legitimate need to access the hospital site, the warning letter includes a form that drivers can complete and return to the hospital authorities explaining their need to access the site. Once verified by the hospital authorities, the vehicle registration plate details

will be entered onto the camera system database to avoid further enforcement action.

If drivers fail to respond to the warning letters, any further detection by the camera system could then result in prosecution action by the police by the issuing of a fixed penalty notice.

Given Councillor Moss-Eccardt's concerns over possible confusion, officers were asked to provide an updated FAQ document on the access restriction on our web pages now that the AAR is open and this has been circulated to all county and district members.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 7th DECEMBER 2010
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.4

Question from Councillor Moss-Eccardt to the Cabinet Member for Customer Service and Transformation Councillor Criswell

If a member chooses to use a non-County email address, a member of the public will be told of the 'correct' address the first time they attempt to send to the obvious firstname.lastname@cambridgeshire.gov.uk address and then have to remember the correct address forever as they will never be told again. Is this level of customer service acceptable in his opinion?

Response from Councillor Criswell Cabinet Member for Customer Service and Transformation

Cllr Moss-Eccardt is one of 25 County Councillors who have chosen, for their own personal reasons, to use an e-mail address other than the County Council address for their correspondence.

Initially where members chose to use their own email addresses the standard MS Exchange based "out of office" functionality was used to send an automatic response to any person emailing the obsolete xx.xx@cambridgeshire.gov.uk to alert them to the fact that the email address is no longer in use.

This response is sent only once and if a correspondent e-mails again, they do not get the message repeated. This is part of the standard Microsoft "Out of Office" email functionality which restricts multiple "out of office" responses in order to prevent "mail loops" which can in certain circumstances cause a mail server to "crash".
However, having evaluated the potential service outage risk in relation the need for the digital accessibility of Members the existing approach has been reviewed and a revised process agreed. An automated rule can be set up which will send back a message to each correspondent, regardless of how many times they e-mail the obsolete inbox. Email traffic will be monitored to the relevant email inboxes on an exceptional basis and the automated rule will be suspended in the event that high traffic levels threaten service availability This option will be restricted to Members only, and all Members who are using non-County Council email addresses will be offered this option should they so wish. This has already been set up for Cllr Moss-Eccardt as a result of his request. The message that will appear is as follows:

This e-mail address is not in use; please re-send your message to xx@yy

I believe that overcomes the issue that Cllr Moss-Eccardt has raised.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 7th DECEMBER 2010
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.4

Question from Councillor Moss Eccardt to the Leader of the Council Councillor Jill Tuck

At the last Council meeting a number of commitments were made by her Cabinet. Could she enumerate them and provide an update on progress, please?

Response from Councillor J Tuck Leader of the Council

At Council on 19th October, there were two commitments made by Cabinet Members to supply written answers to questions raised by members.

1. Councillor Harty undertook to supply an answer to Councillor Kindersley's oral question on the provision of a secondary school in Cambourne.

2. Councillor Pegram undertook to supply a written answer to Councillor Bourke's question about the current cost of the guided busway project on an equivalent basis to the original estimated cost. The question had been asked in the context of the report of the Cabinet meeting of 28th September.

Both answers to the above commitments were circulated to all members via e-mail on 30th November and were placed on the internet with the minutes on 1st December.

Councillor M McGuire undertook to follow up matters raised by Councillor van de Ven in relation to her oral question. She had asked about winter gritting in relation to Great and Little Chishill Parish Council. There was no commitment to supply a written reply, and Councillor McGuire has been able to assure me that the matter had been followed up.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 7TH DECEMBER 2010
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.4

Question from Councillor Bourke to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor Mac McGuire

In the Winter Maintenance Review, maps containing the proposed gritting network were sent out to county, district and parish councillors, for comment. These maps included the detail of the "reduced network", which would be used in the event of there being a shortage of grit, as happened last year. In the case of Cambridge city, the entirety of the city inside the inner ring road was excluded from the reduced gritting network. In practice what this meant was that if there was a prolonged period of extreme bad weather, which sufficiently depleted the stockpiles of grit, the County Council's gritting lorries would not grit a single stretch of carriageway inside the inner ring road of Cambridge. Will the cabinet member please clarify whether this remains the case?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire

The criteria for the reduced routes for winter service included

- A and B Roads
- Links to A&E hospitals and other emergency services
- Strategic locations as defined by Go East
- Roads adjacent to major fen drains (added specifically as a geographic issue).

The majority of these reflect advice from Central Government with the addition from this authority of roads adjacent to deep drains. Recognising that this reduction would only happen if there was a significant problem with salt supply and that the area within the ring road of Cambridge is a 20mph zone this area has not been included in the reduced network. There are many roads in the county, both urban and non-urban which would be similarly affected if there was a salt shortage. The decision to go to a reduced network would not be one that I would relish having to take and so I have challenged officers to ensure they have done all they can to ensure resilience of supply.

However, this year we are trialling a new salt/sugar solution (which is not included within the Central Government monitoring data), on some of the pedestrian areas and cycle ways across the county and whilst we have supplies of this material we will continue to treat these areas.

COUNTY COUNCIL - 7TH DECEMBER WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURES RULE 4

Question fom Councillor Nethsingha to the Cabinet Member for Learning Councillor Harty

How many appeals there have been for Comberton Village College school places this year?

Response from Councillor Harty, Cabinet Member for Learning

To date there have been 12 appeals lodged for this school this academic year. The breakdown by year group is shown below;

3 for Year 8
7 for Year 9
1 for Year 10
1 for Year 11

How many were successful, and how many unsuccessful?

Response from Councillor Harty, Cabinet Member for Learning

Of the appeals heard 8 were successful, a place became available in Year 8, which was offered and accepted by the parent, and an appeal for Year 9 was withdrawn by the parent.

What the cost of each appeal is to the council?

Response from Councillor Harty, Cabinet Member for Learning

Comberton Village College is a foundation school and, therefore, its own admission authority and is responsible for its own appeals. However, the Governing Body of the school choose to buy in the appeal service from the Local Authority Admissions Team through a Service Level Agreement. The college currently pay a fee of £3,260 a year for this service.

Could I also have the same information for Coleridge?

Response from Councillor Harty, Cabinet Member for Learning

To date there have been 4 appeals lodged for this school this academic year. The breakdown by year group is shown below:

3 for Year 7
1 for Year 8
None of these appeals were heard, as places became available before the proposed hearing date. Coleridge, like Comberton Village College, are their own admission authority and is responsible for it's own appeal. Like Comberton, the Governing Body of the school choose to buy in the appeal service from the LA Admissions Team through a Service Level Agreement. The college currently pay a gee of £3,260 a year for this service.

How many children are coming in from Cambourne to go to school in Cambridge City everyday, I am assuming no primary children fall into this category, but if there are any primary school children could I have those figures separately.

Response from Councillor Harty, Cabinet Member for Learning

There are currently 17 Cambourne secondary age children being transported to Cambridge City Secondary schools. However there could be some children coming to Cambridge schools from Cambourne as a result of parental preference.

Cambourne primary aged children, who cannot presently get into one of the Cambourne schools, are currently being transport to Hardwick. The admissions team are not aware of any coming into Cambridge who have been turned away from Cambourne. However, again, there could be some children coming to Cambridge schools from Cambourne as a result of parental preference.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 7th DECEMBER 2010
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.4

Questions from Councillor K Wilkins to the Cabinet Member Adult Social Care Health and Wellbeing F. Yeulett

To ask Councillor Yeulett what level he expects National Indicator (NI) 130 "Social Care Clients receiving Self Directed Support" to reach at the end of each of Q3 and Q4?

Response from Councillor Yeulett Cabinet Member Adult Social Care Health and Wellbeing

The performance to the end of November is 43%. This puts us at 10th in the Country out of 152 Local Authorities with adult social care responsibility, and ahead of the government requirement to achieve 30% by the end of March 2011. The expected performance at Q3 is 45% and at Q4 is 48%. In recognition that Cambridgeshire is implementing a total change from the old care management system to the new self directed support system, the target for 2010/11 was set at 80% at the beginning of the financial year. This target was set prior to the introduction of the improved model of reablement and greater promotion of Assistive Technology and telehealth equipment. These initiatives have an impact on the target by reducing the numerator i.e. the number of people who could receive services through self directed support, but not reducing the denominator i.e. the number of people in receipt of community services. It is accepted that given these other influences, the target of 80% will not be achieved but this does not diminish the positive progress made in Cambridgeshire.

What is holding up progress to bring NI 131 "Delayed Transfers of Care from Hospitals" down towards the target? What action is he personally taking to ensure the number of delayed discharges is reduced?

Response from Councillor Yeulett Cabinet Member Adult Social Care Health and Wellbeing

Officers across the whole NHS and adult social care system are working collaboratively to reduce the delayed transfers for care from hospital. Performance at the end of October was 11.8 delays per week. This brings the performance close to the performance in April 2009 when it was 11.1 and is a significant improvement from February 2010, when the performance was 16.9. Chief Executives from the NHS and our Executive Director, Community and Adult Services meet on a monthly basis to review progress with the whole system approach that is being led by Directors from each organisation. Recognising that we often see an increase in the number of delays during the winter, linked to increased numbers of admissions to the acute hospitals, a number of joint actions have been taken to mitigate this. These include a

single team managing the process of discharge through Addenbrookes and a range of joint investments in voluntary and independent sector providers to reduce avoidable admissions and create additional short term capacity for the winter months.

I proactively monitor the progress of this work through my briefings with the Executive Director, Community & Adults Services and Service Director, Strategy & commissioning (Adult Social Care) and I have confidence that these actions will continue to support the downwards trend towards the target of 8.9 for 2010/11.

COUNTY COUNCIL - 7TH DECEMBER WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURES RULE 4

Question from Cllr Bell to the Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment Councillor Orgee.

I note that this Council spent £6.4 million on Land Fill Tax last year, and the cost is currently £48 per ton. The Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (RECAP) figures for 2008/9 show that East Cambridgeshire District Council had to send 63% of its household waste to landfill, or 18,346 tons, which would cost £880k at £48 per ton.

In 2008/9 East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC) had a recycling rate of 37% of household waste which compared very unfavourably with all the other District Councils in the County, particularly Huntingdon District Council whose rate was 58%. Would Councillor Orgee join with me in expressing concern that, while the other Districts in Cambridgeshire are increasing their household waste recycling rates ECDC's rate is projected to fall to 35%, missing their agreed recycling target, and that the increased cost of Landfill Tax will fall on this authority? While this increase may be reduced by the introduction of the Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) processing plant at Donarbon would he remind Members of ECDC that this new plant has been set up on the basis of all local authorities meeting their agreed recycling targets and that when ECDC reduce their recycling service to residents, ostensibly to 'save money', that the subsequent reduction in recycling that inevitably occurs imposes increased costs on this Council and therefore on the taxpayers of the County, including those in East Cambridgeshire District?

Response from Councillor Orgee, Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment

As a Waste Disposal Authority (WDA), the County Council is responsible for the disposal of all municipal waste; this comprises the residual (black bin/ sack) waste collected by the 5 District Councils (operating as Waste Collection Authorities (WCA)) and the waste from the 9 Recycling Centres across the county. The County Council also receives all the food and green waste (collected in green bins/ brown sacks) and arranges for the composting of this material. The residual waste, green/food waste and the operation of the recycling centres all forms part of the Waste PFI contract with Donarbon.

The District Councils are responsible for kerbside recycling schemes and bring-banks e.g. bottle-banks. The greater the amount of waste recycled at the kerbside, the smaller the amount of residual waste the County Council has to deal with.

Over the 10 years of the RECAP partnership all partners have substantially increased their recycling rates. Indeed we now have some of the top performers in England in our partnership. The rates for recycling (%) and waste arisings per capita from kerbside and brings-banks (kg/person) for 2009/10 are:

Huntingdonshire District Council	55.54%	407 kg/person
South Cambridgeshire District Council	53.47%	420 kg/person
Fenland District Council	50.29%	431 kg/person
Peterborough City Council	44.61%	495 kg/person
Cambridge City Council	40.87%	361 kg/person
East Cambridgeshire District Council	37.15%	351 kg/person

RECAP Average 49.83%

National Average 39.5%

Whilst East Cambridgeshire District Council's performance is less than the average across RECAP, it is only marginally below the national average.

Costs incurred by the County Council as a result of a WCA's performance are twofold: the costs of treating the residual waste, and the recycling credit paid to the WCA for every tonne of waste it recycles.

The residual waste from the WCAs is processed through the Mechanical Biological Treatment Plant (MBT), and any unrecycled material is sent to landfill, which attracts Landfill Tax on top of the costs of processing. Landfill Tax is currently £48 per tonne and is due to rise by £8/te pa until it reaches at least £80/te.

The payment of recycling Credits to WCAs is a statutory duty that the County Council as a Waste Disposal Authority must discharge in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Waste and Recycling Payments) (England) Regulations 2006. The credits are intended to incentivise waste diversion from landfill, by moving the management of waste higher up the Waste Hierarchy in order to minimise its environmental impact.

Therefore it is correct to say that in principle, and outside any Recycling Payments paid by the County Council to the District Councils, a lower tonnage results in less disposal cost to this Authority.

Following the signing of the County Council's contract with Donarbon in March 2008, all the District Councils together with the County Council signed a Partnering Agreement, under which the Districts Councils agreed to use reasonable endeavours to at least maintain the recycling and other waste collection schemes that were in place at that time, and to inform the County Council as soon as reasonably practicable where changes to any collection arrangements are anticipated. The intention was to ensure that the emphasis on kerbside recycling was maintained to ensure that the capacity and lifetime of the MBT plant were not compromised.

Through the RECAP Partnership the County Council Waste Service continues to work with colleagues across all the District Councils in order to improve performance and realise efficiencies. Notably, earlier this year East Cambridgeshire completed a comprehensive review of their waste services. However, following the announcement last June by the new Secretary of State that she would be reviewing all waste policy, East Cambridgeshire decided to

await the outcome of the review due in May 2011 before making any decisions about how best to proceed. Other opportunities are being discussed within the partnership, including exploring opportunities for even closer working as an Advanced Waste Partnership.

In summary, the issue of waste costs is very complex, but it is true to say that the Council seeks to reduce its costs for waste disposal by encouraging recycling by all the District Councils, working as a strong and effective waste partnership.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 7TH DECEMBER 2010
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.4

Question from Councillor K Bourke to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor Mac McGuire

In the case of the Park and Ride service, none of the usual procurement criteria, designed to ensure openness, transparency and non-discrimination, have been satisfied. When the current "agreement" was renewed five years ago the Park and Ride was a successful and profitable service, and destined to become more so. By renewing the current agreement the council permitted itself to bypass the standard procurement legislation and not to invite other major operators to provide the service. Consequently, the current agreement appears to provide an exclusive commercial opportunity for the present operator--the agreement is both anti-competitive and discriminatory.

Why were other operators not given the opportunity to provide this service?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire

The Agreement between the County Council and Stagecoach to which Councillor Bourke refers was entered into in 2005 by the then Deputy Chief Executive for the Office of Environment and Community Services, using his delegated powers under the Council's Contract Regulations which enable contracts to be exempted from the regulations in appropriate circumstances.

However, as Councillor Bourke is aware, we are in the process of considering various options for the future of the Park and Ride bus service and will ensure that any new arrangement fully complies with all applicable rules and regulations.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 7TH DECEMBER 2010
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.4

Written Question from Councillor A Pellew to Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance

Having had the opportunity to review the data provided on the County Council website listing payments to suppliers over £500 (http://goo.gl/g4vlB) I have the following questions;

a) Can a way be found to uniquely identify individuals so that it becomes possible to determine whether or not any of the repeating payments to "Redacted Personal Data" or "Redacted Commercial Data" are to the same entity (maybe using the unique reference in the ERP system?) but to still ensure the privacy and anonymity of the entities? Payments to redacted entities accounted for 1.6M of spend in October *alone*. Is there a reason why this isn't being done already?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

We have been advised not to publish the supplier number (as the unique reference in the ERP system) on account of an increase in reported fraudulent activity at other Councils consequent on publishing spend data. For example, several Council's have been sent letters asking for changes to bank details for large suppliers but upon investigation the letters have not been sent from the companies in question. Internal Audit has asked us not to give out supplier numbers when asked for the same reason. We will explore other ways of achieving this aim, but further guidance from government is expected in the new year which may prescribe a way forward for all authorities.

b) Can you please provide the criteria under which commercial entities can qualify to have their information "Redacted" in these data feeds (approximately 85K of spend over the same period).

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

The commercial data that has been redacted to date is solely for care establishments where vulnerable and abused children/young people have been placed. Publishing the providers whose company name is that of the residential home raised a number of concerns, as by making this information available to the public it could possibly lead to the identification of locations where vulnerable children/young people had been placed. The decision was taken to redact the providers company name as by identifying where children/young people had been placed could inevitably put them at risk.

c) Can a changlog be included on the page (or published separately) so that where a file is updated a note is added?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

We are exploring this suggestion further. We do not have an easy means of doing what is suggested at present, however the changes made to date have largely been around the structure of the files as more guidance comes out rather than to the dataset itself, so we are hopeful provision of a changlog could be resourced. Government guidance awaited in the new year may be prescriptive on this so we will await this before finalising a solution.

d) Can the postcode of the entity be added to the data feeds?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

Information governance are considering this further however audit specifically advise against adding postcodes where the supplier name is redacted. Government guidance may well be prescriptive on this in the next few months. Adding postcodes where the supplier name is redacted poses a risk that individual vulnerable clients and care providers could be identified, so is not acceptable.

e) Can the total amount, not the breakdown, of spend under £500 be published as part of the feed?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

A single line totalling all spend under £500 will be provided with the November data.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 7TH DECEMBER 2010
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.4

Written Question from Councillor A Pellew to Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance

Having had the opportunity to review the data provided on the County Council website listing payments to suppliers over £500 (http://goo.gl/g4vlB) I have the following questions;

a) Can a way be found to uniquely identify individuals so that it becomes possible to determine whether or not any of the repeating payments to "Redacted Personal Data" or "Redacted Commercial Data" are to the same entity (maybe using the unique reference in the ERP system?) but to still ensure the privacy and anonymity of the entities? Payments to redacted entities accounted for 1.6M of spend in October *alone*. Is there a reason why this isn't being done already?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

We have been advised not to publish the supplier number (as the unique reference in the ERP system) on account of an increase in reported fraudulent activity at other Councils consequent on publishing spend data. For example, several Council's have been sent letters asking for changes to bank details for large suppliers but upon investigation the letters have not been sent from the companies in question. Internal Audit has asked us not to give out supplier numbers when asked for the same reason. We will explore other ways of achieving this aim, but further guidance from government is expected in the new year which may prescribe a way forward for all authorities.

b) Can you please provide the criteria under which commercial entities can qualify to have their information "Redacted" in these data feeds (approximately 85K of spend over the same period)?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

The commercial data that has been redacted to date is solely for care establishments where vulnerable and abused children/young people have been placed. Publishing the providers whose company name is that of the residential home raised a number of concerns, as by making this information available to the public it could possibly lead to the identification of locations where vulnerable children/young people had been placed. The decision was taken to redact the providers company name as by identifying where children/young people had been placed could inevitably put them at risk.

c) Can a changlog be included on the page (or published separately) so that where a file is updated a note is added?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

We are exploring this suggestion further. We do not have an easy means of doing what is suggested at present, however the changes made to date have largely been around the structure of the files as more guidance comes out rather than to the dataset itself, so we are hopeful provision of a changlog could be resourced. Government guidance awaited in the new year may be prescriptive on this so we will await this before finalising a solution.

d) Can the postcode of the entity be added to the data feeds?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

Information governance are considering this further however audit specifically advise against adding postcodes where the supplier name is redacted. Government guidance may well be prescriptive on this in the next few months. Adding postcodes where the supplier name is redacted poses a risk that individual vulnerable clients and care providers could be identified, so is not acceptable.

e) Can the total amount, not the breakdown, of spend under £500 be published as part of the feed?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

A single line totalling all spend under £500 will be provided with the November data.